JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

# CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF I. (a) PLAINTIFFS  JARED L. TAYLOR  (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Passaic County, NJ  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				PEFENDANTS RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC. and RYDER TRUCK RENTAL LT				
				and RYDER SYSTEM, INC. and BREAK THE FLOOR PRODUCTIONS LLC D/B/A NUVO and NICHOLAS J. HENDE  County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Miami-Dade County  (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A Jeffrey A. Krawitz, Esq./S 777 Township Line Road (See Attached Addendum	, Suite 120, Yardley, F	r) sional Corporation PA 19067; 267-907	-9600	Attorneys (If Known)	OF LAND IN	VOLVED.		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in O	ne Box Only)			RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
U.S. Government		Not a Party)			and One Box for Defendant)  TF DEF  1 Incorporated or Principal Place			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity     (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and P of Business In A		
				en or Subject of a reign Country		Foreign Nation	06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ely)	FC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature of KRUPTCY	of Suit Code Descriptions.  OTHER STATUTES	
CONTRACT   110 Insurance   120 Marine   130 Miller Act   140 Negotiable Instrument   150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment   151 Medicare Act   152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)   153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits   160 Stockholders' Suits   190 Other Contract   195 Contract Product Liability   196 Franchise   REAL PROPERTY   210 Land Condemnation   220 Foreclosure   230 Rent Lease & Ejectment   240 Torts to Land   245 Tort Product Liability   290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY  310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY Product Liability Product Liability Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability  PRISONER PETITION Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Othe 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	TY	CABOR  Other  LABOR  Other  LABOR  Fair Labor Standards Act  Labor/Management Relations  Railway Labor Act  Family and Medical Leave Act  Cherrology Retirement Income Security Act  IMMIGRATION  Note Indication  Note Indication  Note Indication  Actions  Naturalization Application  Actions	422 Appe	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157  RTY RIGHTS rights at ta - Abbreviated Drug Application emark SECURITY (1395ff) & Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g))  AL TAX SUITS s (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	□ 375 False Claims Act □ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 28 U.S.C. Section Brief description of ca  CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	Appellate Court  tute under which you ar  1 1332 and 28 U.S.  use:  IS A CLASS ACTION	re filing (I	pened Anothe (specify)  Do not cite jurisdictional state	r District  utes unless di		- Litigation - Direct File	
DATE 3 11 1 0	(See instructions):	JUDGE SIGNATURE OF ATT	TORNEY (	DERECORD DESCRIPTION OF THE CORD	DOCKE	T NUMBER		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	AOUNT	APPL VING IED		IUDGE	)	MAG ILID	NGE.	

## ADDENDUM TO CIVIL COVER SHEET

# **Attorneys for Plaintiff**

Michael L. Saile, Jr., Esquire Cordisco & Saile LLC 900 Northbook Drive Suite 120 Trevose, PA 19053 215-642-2335

## 

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

19-1068

DESIGNATION FORM used by counsil or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar) 25 N. 10th Street, Paterson, NJ 07522 Address of Plaintiff: 11690 NW 105 Street, Miami, FL 33178 Address of Defendant: Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Interstate 80 in Richland Township, Clarion County, Pennsylvania RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Judge: \_ Case Number: Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions: Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, so fal security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is is not/ this court except as noted above. 49530 Attorney I.D. # (if applicable) CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only) Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: Federal Question Cases: Insurance Contract and Other Contracts Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts Airplane Personal Injury FELA 2. Assault, Defamation Jones Act-Personal Injury Marine Personal Injury 4. .Antitrust Motor Vehicle Personal Injury Patent 5. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): Labor-Management Relations Products Liability Civil Rights 7. Products Liability - Asbestos Habeas Corpus All other Diversity Cases Securities Act(s) Cases (Please specify): \_ 10. Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): \_

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitrati	on.)
I, Jeffrey A. Krawitz, Esquire counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:	
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages received the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:	overable in this civil action case
Relief other than monetary damages is sought	MAR 13 2019
DATE: 3 13 19 AM A Sun	49530
Morne at-Law LPro Se Maintiff	Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

Telephone	FAX Number		E-Mail Address						
267-907-9600	267-907-9659		jkrawitz@stark-stark.c	om					
3   n   14 Date	Jeffrey A. Krawi Attorney-at-lav		Attorney for Plaintiff	f					
(f) Standard Management -	- Cases that do not fal	l into any one	e of the other tracks.	(2	X)				
(e) Special Management – Commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse smanagement cases.)	s complex and that ne	ed special or	intense management by	(	)				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involve exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for person	al injury or p	property damage from	(	)				
(c) Arbitration – Cases requ	aired to be designated	for arbitratio	on under Local Civil Rule 53.2	2. (	)				
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.									
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.									
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING CASE	MANAGEM	MENT TRACKS:						
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serv side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	ase Management Trac ye a copy on all defend event that a defendan shall, with its first apported arties, a Case Manager	k Designation ants. (See § Int does not appearance, subment Track D	uction Plan of this court, county form in all civil cases at the l;03 of the plan set forth on the gree with the plaintiff regard smit to the clerk of court and specifying to the plaintiff regard to the clerk of court and specifying to the plaintiff regard to the clerk of court and specifying to the plaintiff regard to the clerk of court and specifying to the plaintiff regard to the plai	e time rever ing sa serve o	of se id on				
v. RYDER TRUCK RENTA	L, INC., et al.		NO.						

(Civ. 660) 10/02

JARED L. TAYLOR

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JARED L. TAYLOR 346 Duvier Place Maywood, NJ 07607,

Plaintiff.

V.

RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC. 11690 NW 105 Street Miami, FL 33178, and RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC. D/B/A RYDER TRANSPORTATION SERVICES 11690 NW 105 Street Miami, FL 33178, and RYDER TRUCK RENTAL LT 11690 NW 105 Street Miami, FL 33178, and RYDER SYSTEM, INC. 11690 NW 105 Street Miami, FL 33178, and BREAK THE FLOOR PRODUCTIONS LLC d/b/a NUVO 310 West 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, #35A New York, NY 10019, and NICHOLAS J. HENDERSON 56 Portland Street, Apt. 3 Portland, ME 04101,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

#### CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Plaintiff JARED L. TAYLOR, by and through his undersigned counsel,

and brings the within action against defendants, and avers:

#### **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff JARED L. TAYLOR is an adult individual citizen and resident of the State of New Jersey who resides therein at 346 Duvier Place, Maywood, New Jersey 07607.
- 2. Defendant RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC. (hereinafter referred to as "Ryder Inc."), is a Florida corporation duly authorized and registered to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business and/or registered corporate address of at 11690 NW 105th Street, Miami, Florida 33178.
- 3. Defendant RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC, doing business as RYDER TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, hereinafter referred to as "Ryder Trans."), is a Florida corporation duly authorized and registered to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business and/or registered corporate address of at 11690 NW 105th Street, Miami, Florida 33178.
- 4. Defendant RYDER TRUCK RENTAL LT (hereinafter referred to as "Ryder LT"), is a Delaware corporation and/or business trust, duly authorized and registered to do business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business and/or registered corporate address of 11690 NW 105th Street, Miami, Florida 33178.
- 5. Defendant RYDER SYSTEM, INC. (hereinafter referred to as "Ryder System"). is a Florida corporation with a principal place of business and/or registered corporate address of 11690 NW 105th Street, Miami, Florida 33178.
- 6. Defendant BREAK THE FLOOR PRODUCTIONS LLC. doing business as NUVO (hereinafter referred to as "Break-the-Floor"), is a New York corporation, with a

principal place of business and/or registered corporate address of 5446 Satsuma Avenue, North Hollywood, California 91601.

7. Defendant NICHOLAS J. HENDERSON (hereinafter referred to as "Henderson") is an adult individual citizen and resident of the State of Maine who upon information and belief resides at 56 Portland Street, Apt.3, Portland, Maine 04101.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. There is complete diversity of citizenship and the amount in controversy in this action exceeds \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs.
- 9. A substantial part of the events giving rise to this action occurred within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 10. Defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and Ryder System, conduct significant, systematic, ongoing and continuous business in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 11. Defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System, have multiple physical business locations, offices and/or facilities in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 12. Defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System maintain a corporate office in Alburtis, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, which is located within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 13. Defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System maintain business/retail establishments in, among other locations: Fairless Hills, Bucks County.

  Pennsylvania; Philadelphia, Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania; King of Prussia, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania; and Horsham, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. All of these locations are located within the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

- 14. Defendant Break-the-Floor conducts significant, systematic, ongoing and continuous business in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, including holding shows, events and/or dance competitions in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 15. Defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor's business activities and contacts including tractor and trailer service, maintenance and repairs, parts, labor, operating supplies, fuel and fueling, emergency road service, safety programs, and other activities within Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including the Eastern District of Pennsylvania are directly related to the negligence averments set forth below.
- 16. Plaintiff resides in New Jersey and underwent most of his medical treatment in New Jersey. The Eastern District of Pennsylvania is the most convenient venue for plaintiff.
- 17. Jurisdiction and venue are, therefore, properly placed with this Honorable Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332 and 1391.

#### **AGENCY ALLEGATIONS**

- 18. At all times material to plaintiff's cause of action, defendant Henderson was the operator, driver and/or in control of a certain tractor-trailer then and there operated by said defendant.
- 19. At all times material to plaintiff's cause of action, defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System were the owners, possessors, maintainers and/or in control of a certain tractor-trailer being then and there driven by defendant Henderson.
- 20. At all times material to plaintiff's cause of action, defendant Henderson was the agent, servant, workman, subcontractor, and/or employee of defendants, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System and then and there acting within the course and scope of his authority and employment for and on behalf of said defendants.

- 21. Upon information and belief, at all times material to plaintiff's cause of action defendants, Break-the-Floor, Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, and/or Ryder System were in possession of the co-defendants' tractor and trailer involved in the collision.
- All of the acts alleged to have been done or not to have been done by defendants herein were done or not done by the defendants, their agents, servants, workmen and/or employees acting within the course and scope of their employment and authority for and on behalf of said defendants.

#### GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 23. At the time of the subject collision. Interstate 80 was a divided highway that crosses the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with at least two eastbound lanes and two westbound lanes.
- 24. On March 27, 2017, at approximately 7:20 a.m., plaintiff was resting in the sleeper berth of the tractor-trailer tandem being driven by defendant Henderson in the westbound lanes of Interstate 80 in Richland Township, Clarion County, Pennsylvania.
- 25. At the same time and place, the tractor-trailer was caused to go off the right side of the roadway striking and breaking through a guardrail, thereafter travelling down a steep embankment where it struck several trees and landed on Metz Road, continuing thereafter up an embankment where it came to rest.
- 26. The aforesaid collision caused the cargo of the trailer to break through the front of the trailer crushing the cab and entrapping plaintiff.
- 27. As a result of the negligence, carelessness, and/or recklessness of defendants, plaintiff suffered serious, painful and permanent personal injuries as more particularly described below.

## COUNT I NEGLIGENCE PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANT NICHOLAS J. HENDERSON

- 28. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous allegations as if the same were fully set forth at length herein.
- 29. The aforesaid collision and plaintiff's injuries were directly and proximately caused by the negligence, carelessness, and/or recklessness of defendant Henderson and upon information and belief consisted of the following:
  - a. Failing to keep his vehicle under reasonable control;
  - b. Failing to keep a proper lookout on the roadway:
  - c. Failing to apply the brakes in time to avoid a loss of control;
  - d. Failing to properly stop the commercial vehicle before it left the travel surface:
    - e. Failing to remain alert and attentive under the circumstances;
    - f. Failing to operate his vehicle within the posted speed limit;
  - g. Failing to operate his vehicle at a reasonable speed under the circumstances:
    - in blances,
      - h. Carelessly driving the vehicle in violation of 75 Pa.C.S. § 3714;
      - i. Failing to maintain the lane of travel in violation of 75 Pa.C.S. § 3309;
  - j. Driving while distracted and in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 392.80 and 49

### C.F.R. § 392.82;

k. Driving while impaired by a chemical substance in violation of 75 Pa.C.S.
 § 3802 and applicable federal commercial trucking regulations;

- 1. Driving while ill or fatigued in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 392.3 and/or 49 C.F.R. § 395.3;
- m. Failing to properly inspect and maintain the vehicle for mechanical defect and/or safety issues, problems, and/or concerns in violation of 49 C.F.R. 392.7, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 392.9, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.3, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.7, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.13, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.17;
- n. Failing to properly inspect and assure that the load was properly secured in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 391.13;
- o. Failing to remove the vehicle from the roadway due to known mechanical defects and/or safety issues, problems, and/or concerns;
  - p. Otherwise failing to exercise due and proper care under the circumstances:
- q. Failing to obey all applicable vehicle safety rules, regulations, and laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Occupational Safety & Health Administration regarding vehicle safety, inspections, maintenance, equipment, operation, driving, and driver fitness;
- r. Negligence per se for failing to obey the above-stated laws, rules and regulations; and
  - s. Negligence as a matter of law.
- 30. As a result of the aforesaid collision, plaintiff amongst other injuries sustained a comminuted intra-articular fracture of the distal radius of the right forearm, anterior wedge compression fracture of the C5 vertebral body, non-displaced proximal left fibular fracture,

widening of the C4-C5 joint suggestive of ligamentous injury, rib fracture, L2 transverse process fracture, collapsed lung, concussion, forehead lacerations and TMJ damage.

- 31. As a result of the aforesaid collision, plaintiff has thus far undergone several surgeries and procedures including. ORIF right distal radius comminuted fracture, surgical management of the ulnar styloid fracture and application of plaster splint.
- 32. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has thus far undergone great physical pain and mental anguish and he may continue to endure the same for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 33. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has been compelled to expend large sums of money for medicine and medical care and attention in an effort to affect a cure of his injuries, and he may be compelled to continue to expend such sums for the same purposes for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 34. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has been unable to attend to his usual daily duties and occupation and he may be unable to attend to the same for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 35. As a further result of the collision, the plaintiff has suffered a loss and depreciation of his earnings and earning capacity and power and he may continue to suffer the same for an indefinite time in the future to his great detriment and loss.
- 36. As a further result of this collision, plaintiff also suffered a cosmetic disfigurement which is permanent, irreparable and severe.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in his favor and against Defendant

Henderson an amount in excess of one hundred fifty thousand (\$150,000) dollars, sufficient to

compensate him for his past, present and future pain and suffering, embarrassment and

humiliation, loss of ability to enjoy the pleasures of life, disfigurement, wage loss, income loss, future earning capacity, past medical expenses, future medical expenses, outstanding liens, future medical liens, out-of-pocket expenses, compensatory damages, delay damages, punitive damages, together with interest, costs of suit, and such further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

# <u>COUNT II</u> NEGLIGENCE

# PLAINTIFF v. DEFENDANTS,

RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC, RYDER TRUCK RENTAL INC. d/b/a
RYDER TRANSPORTATION SERVICES, RYDER TRUCK RENTAL LT,
RYDER SYSTEM, INC., and BREAK THE FLOOR PRODUCTIONS LLC d/b/a NUVO

- 37. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges all previous allegations as if the same were fully set forth at length herein.
- 38. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT. Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor qualified the operators of their commercial vehicles including the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 39. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor hired and qualified defendant Henderson as their agent, employee, and/or contractor/subcontractor to drive the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 40. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor trained defendant Henderson as their agent, employee, and/or contractor/subcontractor regarding the maintenance and operation of the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 41. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor supervised defendant Henderson as their agent, employee,

and/or contractor/subcontractor in conjunction with his operation of the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.

- 42. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor retained defendant Henderson as their agent, employee, and/or contractor/subcontractor in conjunction with his operation of the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 43. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans.. Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor permitted defendant Henderson as their agent. employee, and/or contractor/subcontractor to operate the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 44. Surrounding the time of the above-stated collision, Defendant, Henderson was incapable of safely operating the tractor-trailer involved in the in the above-stated collision.
- 45. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT. Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor controlled the use and operation of the tractor-trailer that defendant Henderson was driving surrounding the time of the above-stated collision.
- 46. Upon information and belief, surrounding the time of the above-stated collision, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor loaded, secured, and inspected the cargo of the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.
- 47. Upon information and belief, defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor provided service, maintenance, repairs, parts, labor, operating supplies, fuel and fueling, emergency road service, safety programs, and other activities in conjunction of the tractor-trailer that was involved in the above-stated collision.

- 48. Defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor owed the general public, including plaintiff, an ongoing duty to determine and monitor the qualifications and safety of its drivers.
- 49. Defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor owed the general public, including plaintiff, an ongoing duty to ensure that at all times, the cargo being carried by the truck and trailer was properly loaded, secured, and safe.
- 50. Defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor owed the general public, including plaintiff, an ongoing duty to ensure that at all times, the vehicle was properly inspected, serviced, maintained, and operating in a safe mechanical condition.
- 51. The aforesaid collision and plaintiff's injuries were directly and proximately caused by the negligence, carelessness, and/or recklessness of defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor and consisted of the following:
  - a. Failing to properly hire, train, retain, and supervise employees and/or subcontractors who were capable of safely operating a commercial motor vehicle:
  - b. Permitting a driver to operate its commercial motor vehicle who was incapable of safely operating a commercial motor vehicle or was unfit to do so;
  - c. Permitting a driver to operate its commercial motor vehicle who was not qualified to operate a commercial motor vehicle and/or in violation of C.F.R. § 391.11; and/or 49 C.F.R. § 391.51;
  - d. Entrusting the use of a commercial motor vehicle to a driver who defendant knew or should have known was not capable of operating the commercial

motor vehicle in a safe and careful manner or was likely to use the vehicle in a manner so as to create an unreasonable risk of harm to other persons;

- e. Failing to properly supervise, direct, limit, and/or control the use of the commercial motor vehicle:
- f. Failing to exercise a reasonable degree of care for the supervision and operation of the commercial motor vehicle and any driver who was utilizing the vehicle;
- g. Requiring the driver to conform to a schedule that would require the motor vehicle to be operated at speeds greater than those permitted by law in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 392.6;
- h. Failing to properly inspect and maintain the vehicle for mechanical defects and/or safety issues, problems, and/or concerns and/or in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 392.7, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 392.9, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.3, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.7, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.9, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.13, and/or 49 C.F.R. § 396.17;
- i. Failing to properly inspect and assure that the load was properly secured and/or in violation of 49 C.F.R. § 391.13;
- j. Respondent superior and responsibility for acts and omissions of its driver, who was an agent, servant, workman, sub-contractor, and/or employee of defendant;
  - k. Failing to exercise due care under the circumstances.
- 1. Failing to obey all applicable vehicle safety rules, regulations, and laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Occupational Safety & Health Administration regarding vehicle safety, inspections, maintenance, equipment, operation, driving, and drivers; and

- m. Negligence per se for failing to obey the above-stated laws, rules, and regulations.
- 52. As a result of Ryder Inc.'s, Ryder Trans.'s, Ryder LT's, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor's negligence, carelessness, and/or recklessness by its decision not to vet its drivers. not to train its drivers in their inherently dangerous work, and not to develop or enforce appropriate guidelines consistent with prevailing safety standards and applicable law, Ryder Inc., Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor are liable for damages caused to the plaintiff under applicable law.
- 53. As a further result of Ryder Inc.'s, Ryder Trans.'s, Ryder LT's, Ryder System's, and Break-the-Floor's negligence, carelessness, and/or recklessness in this regard, plaintiff sustained injuries to his head, neck, back, body and limbs, their bones, cells, nerves, tissues, muscles and functions, including but not limited to a comminuted intra-articular fracture of the distal radius of the right forearm, anterior wedge compression fracture of the C5 vertebral body, non-displaced proximal left fibular fracture, widening of the C4-C5 joint suggestive of ligamentous injury, rib fracture. L2 transverse process fracture, collapsed lung, concussion, forehead lacerations and TMJ damage.
- 54. As a result of the aforesaid collision, plaintiff has thus far undergone several surgeries and procedures including, ORIF right distal radius comminuted fracture, surgical management of the ulnar styloid fracture and application of plaster splint.
- 55. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has thus far undergone great physical pain and mental anguish and he may continue to endure the same for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.

- 56. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has been compelled to expend large sums of money for medicine and medical care and attention in an effort to affect a cure of his injuries. and he may be compelled to continue to expend such sums for the same purposes for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 57. As a result of the collision, the plaintiff has been unable to attend to his usual daily duties and occupation and he may be unable to attend to the same for an indefinite time in the future, to his great detriment and loss.
- 58. As a further result of the collision, the plaintiff has suffered a loss and depreciation of his earnings and earning capacity and power and he may continue to suffer the same for an indefinite time in the future to his great detriment and loss.
- 59. As a further result of this collision, plaintiff also suffered a cosmetic disfigurement which is permanent, irreparable and severe.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment in his favor and against Defendants Ryder Inc., Ryder Trans., Ryder LT, Ryder System, and Break-the-Floor an amount in excess of one hundred fifty thousand (\$150,000) dollars, sufficient to compensate him for his past, present and future pain and suffering, embarrassment and humiliation, loss of ability to enjoy the pleasures of life, disfigurement, wage loss, income loss, future earning capacity, past medical expenses, future medical expenses, outstanding liens, future medical liens, out-of-pocket expenses, compensatory damages, delay damages, punitive damages, together with interest, costs of suit, and such further relief as this Court deems just and appropriate.

### **JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues.

STARK & STARK A Professional Corporation

BY:

JEFFREY A. KRAWITZ Attorney I.D. # 49530 jkrawitz@stark-stark.com MICHAEL C. KSIAZEK Attorney I.D. # 201856 mksiazek@stark-stark.com 777 Township Line Road, Suite 120 Yardley, PA 19067 (267) 907-9600 Attorneys for Plaintiff

CORDISCO & SAILE LLC

BY:

MICHAEL L. SAILE, JR. Attorney I.D. # 89669 msaile@cordiscosaile.com 900 Northbrook Drive, Suite 120 Trevose, PA 19053 (215) 642-2335 Attorneys for Plaintiff